721 see p.6) and by the Sangara would have been common knowledge but the neighbouring tribes on the plains were well endowed with land. Land shortage and territorial ambitions were seldom likely to have been sufficient to induce warriors to conquer new lands from traditional enemies.[1]

628 721 Williams (1930:151) says that the Hunjovarehu (including the people of Divinikovari) and the 'Wasida' people to their south are 2 subdivisions of 1 tribe but in other contexts (1930:166) he mentions that these 2 groups carried out organized raids on each other's territory; these were frequent and were characteristic only of intertribal feuds. He refers also to the 'Wasida' as traditional enemies of the Divinikovari 'tribe' (0.9). Monckton too (Territory of Papua 1904-5:36) had reported that the 'Wasida' used frequently to raid ' the low-lying villages of the Kumusi' including the Nimanakwari (or Divinikovari) 'tribe'; indeed, the ancestors of some of the men at Sivepe were killed while fighting the Divinikovari, Togahau and Asigi people to the north. 'The people known as Hunjovarehu' and 'the people of the Periho group', according to Plant, should not be regarded as members of the same tribe (1951: Appendix 4). Informants said that their ancestors were not involved in the isoro which the Wasida villagers fought with the Orokaiva of Sairope - and at times with those at Naropi (Wairope) - and with the people of the Managalas Mountains to the south (see Reay 1953:118; Williams W.23).

Our reason for arguing that all the mountain Orokaiva - the Sangara as well as the Periho (i.e., Wasida) - constituted 1 tribe, is that the basic criterion for identifying a tribe as a distinct unit is its members' joint political activity, as Williams says (1925:406; 1930:156) - the 'almost perpetual state of war with its neighbours'.

619 721 634 In feuds with neighbouring Orokaiva of tribes to the north, members of the Awala District had regular alliances with people as distant as Koropata to the west and the Sangara to the east. However, on no occasion known to us did the mountain Orokaiva as a whole combine in defence or attack en masse. It is even unlikely that the Periho 'welded themselves into a solid group', which Plant (1951:3) claims 'was based on political necessity', defended a recognized common boundary and combined to conduct isoro as a unit.[2] At the time of pacification they alone must

[1] This is true of almost all New Guinea societies, whatever the extent of their political organization: exceptions include Chimbu and the Mae Enga (see Brown and Brookfield 1959:42).

[2] Plant's inclusion of the Wairopi and Sairopi districts in the tribe (see p.6) is hard to reconcile with statements by Williams (W.23) and by Reay (1953:118).

619 721 634 have numbered several thousand at least (nor did they have a 'distinct dialect and a uniformity of custom' that might indicate that they by themselves constituted a tribe).

Every Orokaiva person is recruited by birth to the clan of his father. All members of this descent unit claim but cannot trace[1] common patrilineal descent from a usually eponymous ancestor; they do not always share the same plant emblem (erahu)[2] commonly held by patrilineal groups. A large number of clans are included among the mountain Orokaiva; clan membership does not often overlap with tribal membership (though see Williams 1928:406; 1930:154). It is very rare for the clan to act as a political unit, whatever its functions in the past. Williams (1930:102-8) has in mind a different kind of unit (a small, usually localized group 'united by feelings of actual kinship', scarcely more distant than nuclear family relationships) when he says the clan was 'co-operative... in respect to ceremonies and feasts, and more importantly of fighting'.

851 611 614

[C21] There are several clans represented in the great majority of the present villages and fragments of the same clans - what we call clan branches[3] - will be found scattered among similar composite villages, often a considerable distance away.

Clans are not linked to form a wider descent group. Some members of 2 or more distinct named clans, whose ancestors were all at one time known by the one clan name, sometimes profess closer ties to one another for this reason. Jegase clan, for instance, is said to have formerly included groups which have become independent clans.

---

[1] This disagrees with Williams' description (1930:108) which shows no clear distinction between the clan and lineage (see Royal Anthropological Institute 1960:88-90).

[2] Data from Awala and Wasida villages (see Williams O.83; and Appendix D) differs from the information from Inonda (Crocombe and Hogbin 1963:16).

[3] Note that Williams (1925:410 and 420) uses either the term 'local clan branch' or 'subclan' to denote 'an incipient clan' which has moved away from the parent group but retains either the original clan name while acquiring a new plant emblem or the original plant emblem while assuming a new clan name. Elsewhere (1928:125) he describes how some clans occupy several villages or parts of villages. Some 'branches' or 'sections' may have adopted a distinctive name or taken possession of the subdivision of former clan land they occupy, while others may not yet have taken either step (ibid.).

614 safety. Plant for instance (1951:3) notes that the Isivita
701 villages, strategically situated on a ridge, would occasionally give refuge to fellow tribesmen though not every district would usually have recourse to join the Isivita.

619 Williams ascribes the formation of 'somewhat loose' and
[614] temporary 'confederacies of clans', which conducted raids upon
[701] the tribe's kitoho, to a local spirit. But it is not clear whether by this he means the identification of members of a tribe with one territory or the unity of the 'locality group' which usually takes in a number of 'clan-village units' (see p.34) and which he describes as a more restricted 'sympathy-group' than the tribe (1930:107, 157, 163, 309-12). When he states (1925:407) that 'over and above clan patriarchs there are recognised leaders of small clan confederacies and even - in war-time - of tribes', he seems to equate the tribe with the district among the mountain Orokaiva (in particular Wasida and Isivita; see W.23, 124).[1]

● [634] However, neither the district nor any other local grouping among the mountain Orokaiva was an independent political unit. The territory of this tribe was not so compact as to call for (or even to enable) all its constituent local groups to give continuous mutual support in protecting the integrity of the area they occupied. Nevertheless members of discrete local groups continually formed ad hoc alliances across district boundaries. It is clear that the regular chains of alliances encompassed a wider area than usually described as the tribe (whether Jegasi-Sarahu, Wasida or Periho).

721 The usual stratagem of the isoro was the surprise attack on 1 or 2 selected villages. In these circumstances the victims were able to summon only immediate neighbours to help ward off the attackers and proximity was at least one of the common principles by which specific villages combined in retaliatory raids.

621 An indication that within this tribe the named local groups of
361 villages were territorially distinct units is Belshaw's statement that the population was divided into 'hamlet groups' like Awala 2,

---

[721] [1] There is some doubt whether the evidence in these cases shows that there was even a military leadership in the district (and war is said to have been almost perpetual). The title of the former leader of Isivita (who had not been replaced) is given as embo javoari and the literal meaning is given (1930:104) as 'the man who gives the name' (cf. embo jawo vahai, Crocombe and Hogbin 1963:17), i.e., the deceased eponymous ancestor of one clan. The last renowned war-leader among the Wasida may have been the embo peni (javo), lit. man-big (-name), of a group no larger than a village or clan (see 1925:417; W.23).